DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 985 CG 003 313

By- Smith, Henry C.

Bill Wilkins as a Model for Sensitivity Training.

American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 3 Sep 68
Note- 19p.; Paper presented at American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, August 30 through September 3, 1968.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.05
Descriptors- Behavior Change, *Case Studies (Education), Empathy, *Personal Growth, Personality Theories, *Sensitivity Training, *Teaching Models

This case study is presented as a model for a sensitivity training program planned at Michigan State University. The goals, procedures, and criteria for conducting a program are illustrated. Based on the assumption that empathy is the mainspring of impression formation, and that empathy and evaluation interact, the goal is accurate evaluation. This includes accuracy in the use of stereotypes and personality theories. The training focuses, from beginning to end, on individual persons, and permits the diagnosis of empathic, evaluative, and stereotype errors, both variable and constant. Evaluation, a constant element in training sessions, depends upon criterion instruments which are both brief and reliable. The model was developed for maximum adaptability. (KP)

BILL WILKINS AS A MODEL FOR SENSITIVITY TRAINING

Henry Clay Smith

Michigan State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Paper from the

Symposium on Interpersonal Perception

American Psychological Association Convention

San Francisco, California

September 3, 1968

ED024985

SE 003 313

Bill Wilkins as a Model for Sensitivity Training

Henry Clay Smith

Department of Psychology

APA Convention, 1968

The problems of formulating goals for sensitivity training, measuring progress toward them, developing procedures for achieving them, and designing experiments to measure the success of the procedures have commanded our attention for the past decade. The Case of Bill Wilkins (Table 1) reflects the present state of our thinking. It operationally defines the goals, illustrates the training procedures, and provides criteria for the training program that we plan to conduct this fall (Mietus, 1968).

The Goals of Sensitivity Training

A statement of goals implies assumptions about why and how we form impressions of people and what determines their accuracy. Below, therefore, we first state an assumption, then a training goal based on this assumption, and, finally, a way of determining scores from the Case of Bill Wilkins to measure progress toward the goal.

Empathy is the mainspring of impression formation.

Our needs in relating to others are variable; our motives in forming impressions, consequently, are variable. However, the most pervasive and influential motive is our desire to find out how much and in what ways a person is similar to or different from ourselves.

ED024985

TABLE 1

THE CASE OF BILL WILKINS
John Mietus
Michigan State University

Bill is a 25 year old graduate student in psychology who answered the statements in a long personality inventory on two different occasions. The items in this test are those which he answered in the same way on both occasions. This is a test of your ability to predict his responses.

Thumbnail sketch of Bill:
Bill is from a midwestern upper-middle class family. He is married, and has one child. Bill attended Catholic schools until he came to graduate school. He admires his father for his success and level-headedness. His parents stress achievement, and Bill is very ambitious.

Bill attained high status in his college organizations, and in the service was in a responsible position. He joined ROTC in college partly because of patriotism, partly because being an officer would improve his status. He takes little time off for recreation. However, he does enjoy mixing with people. Bill's health is good, although he does have allergies and frequent tension headaches. During unfavorable service assignments, Bill often felt vaguely ill and went to the dispensary. He considered a number of other professions before deciding on psychology.

He is materialistic, yet moralistic. He has masculine interests, is restrained and controlled. Bill appreciates artistic subjects. He has sometimes alienated people who thought he was too self-confident. He enjoys hearing about shrewd deals, is not above manipulating individuals to achieve his ends, but doubts he would do anything he considers immoral in this respect. He is happy. He philosophizes with himself quite a bit, and is not very interested in current events. Bill is interested in what other people think and do, but does not care to change them; he considers people basically honest, good-natured, but not above little wrong doings.

Part A:

Bill's responses to the following statements are the <u>same as the responses of men-in-general</u>. A large number of men took the same personality inventory Bill did. For each of the statements below at least two-thirds of the men answered in the same way that he did. Your task is to predict how <u>Bill</u> responded to the statements and also to indicate how <u>you</u> would respond.

Mark "1" if you think Bill answered <u>true</u> to the statement and you think the statement is <u>true</u> or more true than false of yourself. (TT)

Mark "2" if you think Bill answered <u>false</u> to the statement and you think the statement is <u>false</u> or more false than true of yourself. (FF)

Mark "3" if you think Bill answered <u>false</u> to the statement and if you think the statement is <u>true</u> or more true than false of yourself. (FT)

Mark "4" if you think Bill answered <u>true</u> to the statement and if you think the statement is <u>false</u> or more <u>false</u> than true of yourself. (TF)

Bill's Answers		
F	1.	I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
T	2.	I do not always tell the truth.
F	3.	I am troubled by discomfort in the pit of my stomach every few days or oftener.
F	4.	I have often wished I were a girl. (Or if you are a girl, I have often wished I were a boy.)
F	5.	I am easily downed in an argument.
T	6.	My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
F	7.	I would like to be a florist.

F 8. Crit' ism or scolding hurts me terribly.
F 9. Som :imes I feel as if I must injure either myself or someone else.
F 10. I used to keep a diary.
F 11. I have been inspired to a program of life based on duty which I have since carefully followed.
F 12. What others think of me bothers me.
T 13. When someone says silly or ignorant things about something I know about, I do not try to set him right.
F 14. I am not very religious (less than most people).
F 15. A person should try to understand his dreams and be guided by or take warning from them.
T 16. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
F 17. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it.

Part B:

Bill's responses to the following statements are the OPPOSITE of those of men-in-general. That is, if Bill answered "true", at least two-thirds of the men would answer "false" and viceversa. Your task is to predict how Bill responded to the statements and also to indicate how you would respond.
Mark this section in the same manner as you did in Part A "1" (TT) "2" (FF) "3" (TF) , "4" (FT).

Bill's
Answers

T 18. I do not try to correct people who express an ignorant belief.
T 19. I have spells of hay fever or asthma.
T 20. Children should not be taught all the main facts of sex.
F 21. I enjoy the excitement of a crowd.
F 22. I usually "lay my cards on the table" with people that I am trying to correct or improve.
F 23. I like to let people know where I stand on things.
T 24. I am afraid of fire.
F 25. I strongly defend my own opinions as a rule.
F 26. During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in petty thievery.
T 27. I seldom find it necessary to stand up for what I think is right.
F 28. At times my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
T 29. I pray several times a week.
F 30. Any man who is willing and able to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
T 31. I am entirely self-confident.
T 32. I tend to be interested in several different hobbies rather than stick to one of them for a long time.
F 33. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.
F 34. I like or have liked fishing very much.
F 35. I try to remember good stories to pass them on to other people.
T 36. When I leave home I worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.

Part C:

Bill responded "true" to one of the statements in each of the following pairs and "false" to the other. Consider both statements in each pair, and then

Mark "1" if you think Bill answered true to the FIRST statement (1) of the pair and if you think the first statement (1) is true or more true than false of yourself. (TT)

Mark "2" if you think Bill answered false to the FIRST statement of the pair and if you think the first statement is false or more false than true of yourself. (FF)

Mark "3" if you think Bill answered false to the FIRST statement of the pair and if you think the first statement is true or more true than false of yourself. (FT)

Mark "4" if you think Bill answered true to the FIRST statement of the pair and if you think the first statement is false or more false than true of yourself. (TF)

NOTE: The column to the left gives Bill's actual answers to the first statements. (D), following his answer, indicates that a "true" answer to this statement was judged by college students as more desirable than a true answer to the second statement. (U), following his answer, indicates that a "true" was judged as less desirable. The number in ( ) following a statement is the mean judged desirability of a true answer to the statement.

Bill's Answers

F (U) 37. (1) People often disappoint me.(4.1)
(2) I wake up fresh and rested most mornings. (7.8)

F (D) 38. (1) I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter. (4.6)
(2) Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little. (3.7)

T (D) 39. (1) I would like to hunt lions in Africa. (5.6)
(2) I find it hard to make talk when I meet people. (3.5)

F (D) 40. (1) I wish I were not so shy. (5.5)
(2) I seldom ask people for advice. (3.5)

F (U) 41. (1) I have had periods in which I lost sleep over worry. (3.9)
(2)I am neither gaining nor losing weight. (6.1)

F (D) 42. (1) I liked "Alice in Wonderland." (5.8)
(2) I do not mind seeing women smoke. (4.6)

T (D) 43. (1) I prefer work which requires close attention, to work which allows me to be careless.(6.2)
(2) During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in thievery. (3.9)

F (U) 44. (1) In school I found it very hard to talk before the class. (3.6)
(2) I practically never blush. (5.7)

F (D) 45. (1) I would like to be a singer. (5.8)
(2) I do not like to be with a crowd which plays jokes on one another. (4.6)

F (U) 46. (1) When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about (3.8)
(2) Something exciting will almost always pull me out of it when I am feeling low. (6.2)

T (U) 47. (1) I think nearly everyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble. (3.5)
(2) Sometimes I get so excited I find it hard to go to sleep.(4.6)

T (U) 48. (1) I would not like to belong to several clubs or lodges. (2.6)
(2) Some of my family have quick tempers. (4.5)

F (U) 49. (1) The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it. (4.8)
(2) I can read a long time without tiring my eyes. (6.8)

F (U) 50. (1) At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone. (3.6)
(2) I like to flirt. (5.7)

T (D) 51. (1) I have never felt better in my life than I do now. (7.4)
(2) Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about. (4.0)

T (D) 52. (1) It does not bother me that I am not better looking. (6.0)
(2) I like to poke fun at people. (3.6)

Part D:

T (D) 53. (1) I have very few fears compared to my friends. (6.0)
(2) I frequently find myself worrying about something. (3.6)

T (U) 54. (1) I have not had to be rough with people who were rude or annoying. (4.5)
(2) I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone who has opposed me. (5.1)

T (D) 55. (1)I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason. (6.6)
(2) Sometimes when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly. (4.0)

F (D) 56. (1) Several times I have been the last to give up trying to do a thing. (6.4)
(2) It is unusual for me to express strong approval or disapproval of the actions of others. (4.8)

T (D) 57. (1) I daydream very little. (5.6)
(2) I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something. (3.6)

F (U) 58. (1) There are certain people whom I dislike so much that I am inwardly pleased when they are catching it for something they have done. (3.9)
(2) I very seldom have spells of blues. (6.3)

T (U) 59. (1) I do not think I feel more intensely than most people do. (4.0)
(2) My mother or father often made me obey even when I thought it was unreasonable. (5.1)

F (D) 60. (1) It is always a good thing to be frank. (6.4)
(2) At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much. (4.4)

T (D) 61. (1) I very much like hunting. (6.0)
(2) I don't blame anyone for trying to grab everything he can get in this world. (3.8)

T (U) 62. (1) If I were an artist, I would not like to draw flowers. (4.0)
(2) If I were in trouble with several friends who were equally to blame, I would rather take the whole blame than to give them away. (5.2)

T (D) 63. (1) I like to talk about sex (5.5)
(2) I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically. (2.9)

T (U) 64. (1) When I was a child I didn't care to be a member of a crowd or gang. (4.1)
(2) When I was a child, I belonged to a crowd or gang that tried to stick together through thick and thin. (5.8)

T (D) 65. (1) I do not have a great fear of snakes. (6.0)
(2) I have difficulty in starting to do things. (3.7)

T (U) 66. (1) I am not apt to hide my feelings to the point that people may hurt me without knowing it. (4.6)
(2) I am always disgusted with the law when a criminal is freed through the arguments of a smart lawyer. (5.2)

F (U) 67. (1) It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of things. (3.9)
(2) I like to cook. (6.5)

F (U) 68. (1) At times I have very much wanted to leave home. (4.0)
(2) I have never been in trouble with the law. (7.1)

F (D) 69. (1) Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world." (6.2)
(2) I dream frequently. (4.9)

T (U) 70. (1)It is not hard for me to ask help from my friends even though I cannot return the favor. (4.7)
(2) I have never had any breaking out on my skin that has worried me. (6.1)

T (U) 71. (1) I like tall women. (5.3)
(2) I am very careful about my manner of dress. (7.1)

T (D) 72. (1) Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me. (6.4)
(2) A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct. (3.9)

The degree to which a person assumes that another person's feelings, thoughts and behavior is similar to his own is his "empathy" (Smith, 1966).

Research results indicate that we pay more attention to, remember more about, and like better people who are like ourselves. Bakan and Leckart (1966), for example, found that extraverts paid more attention to extraverted than to introverted pictures and concluded that a personality trait is a "relatively permanent

readiness to respond selectively to stimuli congruent with the trait." Kagan (1968) found that studious girls recalled better what other studious girls said than they did what gregarious girls said and vice versa. From their long series of studies, Byrne and Clore (1967) conclude that there is probably no physical or social trait, income level, kind of behavior, opinion, attitude, ability, or taste which we like people to be dissimilar to ourselves; "Attraction toward a stranger varies as a linear function of the proportion of that stranger's attitudes which are congruent with those of the subject." The intensive studies of the acquaintance process by Newcomb (1963) concluded that we look for, are attracted to, and associate with "those who are perceived, usually with a considerable accuracy, as having notions similar to one's own of what is important and as having attitudes similar to one's own toward important things."

Why should impression formation be dominated by the desire to find out if a person is like us? Perhaps we learn early that such people are most likely to understand our needs, to want to help us, and to be able to do so. Byrne, Clore, and Worchel (1967) suggest that the most pervasive reason may be that we are chronically seeking "consensual validation" of our views of reality. Is there a God? Who should I vote for as president? What is the best way to raise children? Facts can rarely confirm our answers; other people can, for they may have the same answers that we do.

It is impossible, we assume, to eliminate the empathic drive. It is possible, however, to develop <u>empathic accuracy</u>,i.e., the ability to predict correctly in what ways a person is like and in what ways different from us.

Each of the 72 items in Bill Wilkins' test contributes to a measure of empathic accuracy. Bill, for example, answered "false" to the first statement. Consequently, if the respondent answers "2" ("I would answer false and I think Bill answered false") or "3" ("I would answer true but I think Bill answered false") he would be correct. If he answered "1", he would be incorrectly assuming similarity. If he answered "4", he would be incorrectly assuming dissimilarity. For the empathic accuracy as well as for other keys to the test there are always two answers that are correct, two answers that are incorrect. We do not have reliability data for this form as yet. However, the reliabilities of earlier forms indicate that it should be close to .80.

<u>All Impressions are Evaluative</u>

People often talk and act as if impression formation is a process of recording what is "out there": Eyes are cameras, ears are microphones, and brains are computers that sort and edit facts. Our impressions, however, are more like pictures than photographs. And a central quality of these mental pictures is their lightness or darkness. While we are describing a person we are simultaneously evaluating his goodness or badness. Furthermore, we <u>intend</u> to evaluate him. Empathy and evaluation interact: Those like ourselves we evaluate highly; those with high evaluations we assume are like ourselves.

If this assumption is correct, then the aim should not be to eliminate evaluations but to improve their accuracy. The goal should be to develop the ability of the trainee to predict accurately when a person will describe himself in favorable or unfavorable ways, when he will describe others in favorable or unfavorable ways, and when he will behave in competent or incompetent ways.

Parts C and D of Bill Wilkins measure the evaluative accuracy of the respondents. The pairs of statements have been arranged so that a "true" answer to one of them is more desirable than a "true" answer to the other. In item 37, for example, a "true" response to "People often disappoint me" was given an average desirability rating by college students of 4.1 while a "true" response to "I wake up fresh and rested most mornings" had a rating of 7.8. The first statement is the more desirable in 18 cases, the less desirable in the other eighteen. Bill answered "true" to nine of the less desirable answers, false to the other nine; "true" to 11 of the desirable items, "false" to the other 7. (There were not enough actual false answers to balance the true answers to the desirable items).

Individual evaluative errors are indicated by the failure of the respondent's predictions for Bill to agree with his actual answers. A measure of constant evaluative errors is obtained by subtracting the predictions that were <u>incorrectly</u> undesirable from those that were <u>incorrectly</u> desirable. Thus, if the first figure were 0 and the second was 10, the respondent would be assuming that Bill had a much more favorable evaluation of himself than he actually did.

<u>The Use of Stereotypes is Inevitable</u>

A stereotype is the standardized picture of a group that we "impress" upon each member of that group. Many kinds of errors may arise as the result of using stereotypes in judging individuals. The picture of a group is always incomplete and often mistaken. When it is not mistaken, it is often exaggerated. When it is not exaggerated, the causes of the group's distinctive characteristics are generally distorted. Still, analyses of judgments have regularly emphasized the strong influence of the stereotype component (Cronbach, 1955; Cline and Richards, 1962). Even more, people often make more accurate predictions on the basis of their stereotypes than on the basis of fuller information about a person (Stelmachers and McHugh, 1964).

The most obvious reason for the pervasive use of stereotypes is that they save time and effort. In relating to others, we want to find out if they are like or different from us and to evaluate them on the basis of the answer. Stereotypes conveniently combine description and evaluation. Campbell (1967) has stressed the impossibility of separating the descriptive from the evaluative in stereotypes. The English, for example,

describe themselves as reserved and respectful of the privacy of others. Yankees, however, describe the English as snobbish, cold and unfriendly. The Yankees describe themselves as friendly, outgoing, and open-hearted. The English describe them as intrusive, forward, and pushing.

The goal in sensitivity training cannot be to eliminate the use of stereotypes; it must be to improve their accuracy. Parts A and B of Bill Wilkins provide a measure of the accuracy of the respondent's picture of the typical man. Since he is informed in Part A that Bill's answers were exactly the same as those of the typical man in Part B that his answers were exactly opposite of the typical man, the number of his correct answers is a measure of both his accuracy in predicting Bill and in predicting the responses of the average man.

Personality Theories are Universal

A theory is a set of concepts with assumed relationships between them. It is a final assumption of our approach to sensitivity training that everyone has a personality theory and uses it in forming his impressions of people and making predictions from these impressions. The difference between the theories of the layman and the scientist are a matter of degree and not of kind. The theories of the layman are less explicit, less verifiable, and less often verified than those of the scientist.

For the scientist, a theory has the great value of preventing him from being confused and paralyzed by the complexities of reality, for his theory tells him not only what to look for but also what not to look for or worry about. The personality theories of laymen also tell them not only what to look for but also what not to look for or worry about.

Like the scientist, the layman selects some concepts as relevant and rejects others as irrelevant. Unlike the scientist, however, the layman favors concepts with a high evaluative loading. Koltur (1962), for example, found that laymen rated such traits as cruel, dishonest, sarcastic, loyal, and friendly as most relevant in forming their impressions of people. Furthermore, laymen assume closer relationships between relevant concepts than is common among scientists. Koltur, for example, found that a person who was rated as cruel was highly likely to be rated as dishonest, disloyal, and unfriendly. Laymen stick to their theories: Once it is known that a person has one trait, other traits that are assumed to be related to the first one are ascribed to the person regardless of who he is. Secord and Berscheid (1963), for example, found the same pattern of traits were ascribed to a white or Negro who was assumed to have the same initial trait.

It is a dubious venture to teach students explicit personality theories in the hope that they will make effective use of them. Instead, they may reject them as irrelevant, or, much more likely, fit them into their own implicit theories. Training, rather,

should aim to make the trainees more aware of their own theories and to provide the trainees with information that will permit them to check and to revise them.

Principles of Training

The principle that training should focus from beginning to end upon single persons is supported by both our teaching experiences and research results. Case studies are highly interesting to trainees and do much to bypass problems involving differences in educational background. Their use permits the development of a training program unit by unit. Their use also forces the trainee to come to immediate grips with the processes by which he naturally forms his impressions of people-- by searching for similarities and differences, by evaluating, by using stereotypes, and by using implicit personality theories.

The approach receives indirect but strong support from findings indicating the central importance of interaction effects. Our original training emphasis was upon correcting the constant errors of judges. People, we had assumed, varied in the general accuracy of their stereotypes, their general tendency to judge people as more desirable or less desirable than they actually were, and their general tendency to assume that people were more or less similar to themselves than they actually were.

Our findings, however, show that these general tendencies are quite weak. They have repeatedly shown that stereotype accuracy is quite specific. Most recently, for example, Spier (1968) correlated scores on tests of the ability to differentiate between the interests of executives and unskilled workers, between the interests of psychologists and nonpsychologists, and between the typical qualities of happily, unhappily married and divorced men and women. While the reliabilities of each of these scales was close to .70, their median intercorrelation was less than .25.

Price (1968) has tried to devise a measure of general evaluative tendencies. He developed three cases, one college girl and two men, modeled after Parts C and D of Bill Wilkins. Evaluative tendencies within cases were quite apparent. However, there were no significant correlations across cases: People who tended to rate one person in too desirable a fashion did not tend to rate others in the same way. Lynch (1968) has had slightly more success in devising a measure of general empathic tendencies. We have tentatively concluded that the accuracy of judgments is primarily dependent upon interactions: Interactions between stereotypic, evaluative, and empathic tendencies; interactions between the judge, the judged, and the judging situation. The case study approach seems most suitable for clarifying these interaction tendencies.

The weaknesses of the case study have been that it did not make principles explicit and did not give information which would permit trainees to assess the soundness of their views of the person. The programmed case study (Daley, 1966) attempts to correct for these weaknesses, as the Case of Bill Wilkins illustrates.

Nothing is more universally accepted as essential for learning about anything than feedback (Knowledge of results, reinforcement, etc.). Yet almost never in everyday life, and in sensitivity training only rarely, do people receive valid information about the accuracy of their judgments. The Bill Wilkins model indicates a variety of feedback patterns: The trainee may be given feedback on individual items, on meaningful groups of items, or on the case as a whole. However, we have painfully learned that, while feedback may be essential for learning, it is often not sufficient. The learner must not only know that he was right or wrong in his predictions, but must have some idea of why. The Bill Wilkins model permits the diagnosis of empathic, evaluative, and stereotype errors, both variable and constant.

The Design of a Training Session

The setting of our training has been the meetings of an introductory personality course with several hundred students. Marital Stereotypes (Table 2) illustrated a typical session. It was the third of three meetings concerned with stereotype accuracy.

The "training period" is the core of the session. The dozen statements A through L provided the training materials. The feedback on the statements was based on the data of Johnson and Terman (1935). The statements included in both the criteria instruments and the training material were selected through repeated item analyses. The training materials are arranged in order of difficulty. Thus more than 90 percent of students get item "A" correct whereas less than 40 percent get item "L" correct. The most discriminating items were reserved for the criterion instruments.

At the beginning of a training period, the students are given one or more specific principle that they are asked to apply in making their judgments. In this session, they were told: Use your knowledge of similar people. In applying the principle, the students were asked to write down the names of several divorced women that they knew, several whom they thought to be happily married, and several whom they thought to be unhappily married. They were then asked to consider the first four statements and judge which of their groups were best described by the statement. They were then given the correct answers on these four and asked to try the next four. The process was repeated a third time for the last four. This principle was the only one of six methods that Wakeley (1961) used that resulted in improvements in predictive accuracy.

Another specific principle that we have frequently used, and used in this session, is: Listen to what others have to say before making your predictions. In applying the principle to a large group, we select three or four members of a class as a panel. The panel is asked to make their predictions and one of them explains his answers. Panel members who disagree are then asked to explain their reasons. Class members as a whole then make their own independent judgments. Finally, feedback is given to the panel and to the class. They then repeat the process with the next set of items.

TABLE 2

Marital Stereotypes Training Session

Morris Spier

Michigan State University

This exercise is designed to improve your understanding of the typical happy, unhappy, and divorced man and woman. The correct answers throughout are based on an analysis of the replies of members of each of these groups to lengthy and confidential questionnaires. For example, 100 happily married, 100 unhappily married, and 100 divorced women answered the question: "Do you prefer a play to a dance?" Results:

81% of the happily married women answered "yes".
58% of the unhappily married women answered "yes".
44% of the divorced women answered "yes".

Therefore, the correct answer to the statement "most apt to prefer a play to a dance," is "happily married women."

The exercise follows this sequence:

A. Men pretest. Answer statements 1 through 16 for men.
B. Woman pretest. Answer the statements 33 through 44 for women.
C. Training Period. STOP when you have completed the pretests. The instructor will now provide information giving you a more accurate understanding of the typical happily married, unhappily married, and divorced woman. The statements in the training materials are indicated on the other side by "A", "B", etc.
D. Woman Post-Test. After the training, answer the statements in the woman test again, following the numbers in parentheses, i.e., "33" is (45), "34" is (46), etc.
E. Man Post-Test. Can you apply what you have learned about women to men? To find out, answer the statements in the men test again, this time following the numbers in parentheses, i.e., "1" is (17) "2" is (18), etc.

A. MEN PRETEST AND POST-TEST
Mark: "1" if you think the correct answer is "happily married men"
"2" if you think the correct answer is "unhappily married men"
"3" if you think the correct answer is "divorced men"

1. (17) Least interested in artistic activities. (2)
2. (18) Most dislikes foreigners. (2)
3. (19) Most apt to like the occupation of novelist. (3)
4. (20) Most apt to like religious people. (1)

5. (21) Slowest in making decisions. (2)
6. (22) Most dislikes modern languages. (2)
7. (23) Most often experiences feelings of loneliness. (3)
8. (24) Least often takes the lead to enliven a dull party. (2)

9. (25) Least interested in the occupation of teacher. (2)
10. (26) Most likely to organize a club or team. (1)
11. (27) Most likely to enjoy competition. (3)
12. (28) Most meticulous and methodical in work. (1)

13. (29) Most likely to stress quality in his work. (1)
14. (30) Most likely to enjoy taking risks. (3)
15. (31) Most prefers fashionably dressed people. (3)
16. (32) Most prefers to make plans with others. (1)

B. WOMEN PRETEST AND POST-TEST:
Mark: "1" if you think the correct answer is "happily married women"
"2" if you think the correct answer is "unhappily married women"
"3" if you think the correct answer is "divorced women"

33. (45) Most willing to be unconventional. (3)
34. (46) Most interested in being an inventor. (3)
35. (47) Most often troubled by feelings of inferiority. (2)
36. (48) Most apt to arrive late for work. (2)
37. (49) Most prefers work that makes heavy demands. (3)
38. (50) Most interested in avoiding technical responsibilities (2)
39. (51) Most apt to like religious people. (1)
40. (52) Least effective in emergencies. (2)
41. (53) Most ambitious. (3)
42. (54) Most apt to like old people. (1)
43. (55) Most conservative in social and political opinions. (1)
44. (56) Most apt to like people who never drink. (1)

C. TRAINING MATERIALS. The materials are designed to give you practice and feedback in applying the principles outlined in the training discussion. Do not answer any of these statements until told to do so. "H" stands for happy, "U" for unhappy, "D" for divorced women.

H U D A. Most often has spells of dizziness. (2)
H U D B. Most likes picnics and excursions. (1)
H U D C. Most likely to consider themselves as nervous. (2)
H U D D. Most interested in change and travel. (3)

H U D E. Most apt to like music. (1)
H U D F. Least willing to work things out for themselves. (2)
H U D G. Most prefers taking chances to playing safe. (3)
H U D H. Most self-assertive and self reliant. (3)

H U D I. Least methodical. (2)
H U D J. Most apt to dislike working in isolation. (3)
H U D K. Most dislikes quick-tempered people. (1)
H U D L. Most apt to like playing chess (1)

D. WOMAN POST-TEST. After you have answered the training statements and corrected them, answer the women test again to determine whether your stereotype accuracy has improved. Use the numbers in parentheses, i.e., (45) instead of "33", etc.

E. MAN POST-TEST. Try, finally, to apply what you have learned about women to men. Answer again the statements in the Man Test. This time, however, use the numbers of the statements in parentheses, i.e., (16), (18),etc, in recording your answers.

F. FINAL FEEDBACK. The correct answers for both the men and women tests will be read to you at the end of the exercise.

While students report that they like and learn from listening, it is difficult to decide how to select the best panel members. Volunteers tend to be bold and articulate, but inaccurate. When we have attempted to select a panel of "experts" on the basis of pre-tests (those above the 90th percentile), we have found the group resistant to participating and often vague in their explanations. These results are consistent with the findings of Francher (1967) that those who are best able to conceptualize and communicate their impressions are not the most accurate predictors.

Another principle that we have gathered data on is Delay the formation of impressions. In this case we have had half the class complete the pretest and the other half not. Those who did not complete the pretest did slightly better on the post-test. We are only now beginning to formulate a set of such specific training principles. The training design permits a quick and incisive way of evaluating them.

The Evaluation of Training

Evaluation has been a constant element in our training sessions. The marital stereotypes session, for example, involved not only the measurement of the amount of transfer from the training statements to other statements about happily married, unhappily married, and divorced women (33 through 56). It also involved determining whether what had been learned about women would generalize to men (1-32). Also, as we have suggested, the form of the session permitted us to evaluate the effectiveness of the delay principle. In addition, the students again answered the statements 1 through 16 six weeks later to determine whether what had been learned was retained.

The practicality of evaluations within a single session is dependent upon having brief criterion instruments: the soundness of the evaluations depends upon the reliability of these instruments. Consequently, we have devoted considerable effort to the selection of discriminating items. The split-half reliability for the sixteen items in the men test is about .60; for the twelve items in the women test, .50. In the process of criterion development, we have verified that the sensitivity of an item to the influence of training is dependent not only upon its discrimination value but also upon its difficulty. We have compared improvement as a result of training on easy items (75% or more correct on first administration), moderately difficult items (50-74%), and hard items (less than 50%). Training resulted in no improvement on the easy items, some improvement on the hard items, and most improvement on the moderately difficult ones.

How do students react to training that involves such a heavy load of evaluation? We asked several hundred students at the end of two different quarters to rank the five courses they were currently taking from (1) the most valuable to (5) the least valuable to them. In one quarter, the average ranking was 2.9; in the other, 3.3. That is, the typical student thought the course was as valuable as the typical course he was taking. In all the programs, we have informed students at the first meeting about how the course would be run and why, made each session a complete unit, and given students details not only about their individual performance but about the performance of the group as a whole. Still, students are more enthusiastic about the training without the evaluation. The marriage stereotype session was rearranged into sequential training exercises with 14 statements in each exercise. The materials were used with two adult education groups. Both groups rated the session as extremely valuable (Spier, 1968).

What is the relationship between subjective rankings and objective gains? The answer is clear: None. Several times we have correlated the rankings with a variety of pretest, post-test, and gain scores. We have never found a significant correlation with reported satisfaction. Furthermore, we

have found no relationship between such rankings and a variety of other variables: Personality trait measures, scholastic aptitude, grade in the course, general grade point average, etc. We seem to have duplicated the finding of clinical and industrial psychologists that the relationships between client satisfaction and improvement and between worker satisfaction and productivity are, at present, unpredictable.

The Adaptability of the Model

What do we want to understand and about whom? Sensitivity training programs generally imply a clear answer: Graduate students, the experiences and behavior of their clients; executives, their subordinates, policemen, their rioting fellow citizens. Our concern, however, has been with the "how" of successful training. Consequently, we have chosen the most convenient answers to the question: The "who" has been our students; the "what", statements from the MMPI; and the "whom", a cooperating graduate student.

Our aim is to develop a training model of maximum adaptability. We have presented Bill Wilkins in writing; he could be presented on tape, film, or in person. He is a graduate student, he could be a four year old, a psychopath, or a Nigerian. Our setting has been a large undergraduate class; it could be a therapy session, a T-group meeting, or a seminar. The student is asked to predict Bill's responses to the MMPI, he could be asked to predict Bill's next response in a therapy session, his voting behavior, or his reactions to situations of violence. The aim of our program has been to improve the student's general ability to understand people; it might have the more attainable aim of improving his specific ability to understand one kind of behavior or one kind of person. To translate any of these possibilities into even one useful session is a considerable task. Once useful, however, the materials would stay useful.

References

Bakan, P., and Leckart, B. T. Attention, extraversion and stimulus-personality congruence. Perception and Psychophysics, 1966, 1, 355-357.

Byrne, D, and Clore, G. L., Jr. Effectance arousal and attraction. J. Person. and Soc. Psychology, 1967, 6 (4 whole No. 638).

Cline, V. B., and Richards, J. M. Components of accuracy of interpersonal perception scores and the clinical and statistical controversy. Psychol. Rec., 1962, 12, 373-379.

Daley, C. A. The experimental study of clinical guessing. J. Individual Psychol., 1966, 22, 65-79.

Fancher, R. A. Accuracy versus validity in person perception. J. consult. Psychol., 1967, 31, 264-269.

Johnson, W. B. and Terman, L. M. Personality characteristics of happily married, unhappily married and divorced persons. Charact. & Pers., 1935, 3, 290-311.

Kagan, J. On the need for relativism. Amer. Psychol., 1967, 22, 131-142.

Koltur, Barbara B. Some characteristics of intrajudge trait correlations. Psychol. Monogr., 1962, 76 (33 Whole No. 552).

Lynch, P. Development and evaluation of an empathy training program. Unfinished M.A. thesis, Michigan State Univ. 1968.

Mietus, J. Development of a multiple component criterion for the evaluation of sensitivity training. Unfinished M.A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1968.

Newcomb, T. M. Stabilities underlying changes in interpersonal attraction. Amer. Psychologist, 1963, 66, 376-386.

Price, K. Is the favorableness of interpersonal evaluations a general trait? Unfinished M. A. thesis, Michigan State University, 1968.

Secord, P. F. and Berscheid, Ellen. Stereotyping and the generality of implicit personality theory. J. Pers., 1963, 31, 65-78.

Smith, H. C. Sensitivity to People. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Spier, M. Evaluation of a stereotype accuracy program. Unfinished Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State Univ., 1968.

Stelmachers, Z. T. and McHugh, R. B. Contribution of stereotyped and individualized information to predictive accuracy. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 28, 234-242.

Toch, H., and Smith, H. C. (eds.) Social Perception: The Development of Interpersonal Impressions. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand.

Wakeley, J. H. The effects of special training on accuracy in judging others. Ph.D. thesis, Michigan State Univ., 1961.